

R E M A R K S

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-14 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1-14 are rejected. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 4, and 9 are amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-14 are now pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,970,133 issued to Salimando. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Salimando teaches a communication network including an exchange carrier network 10, a calling router 50 connected to a calling party 70, and a called router 60 connected to a called party 80. The exchange carrier network includes a switching system 20 that performs call processing and routing functions for calling party 70 and called party 80. A calling party 70 initiates a call through the calling router 50. The switching system 20 receives the call, extracts call information from the call, and accesses information from a database 40 specific to the called party 80. A portion of the accessed information is passed to an announcement system 30 to be converted from text to voice signals. Switching system 20 connects announcement system 30 via calling router 50 to calling party 70 (Salimando, col. 3, lines 55-56). Announcement system 30 transmits the converted voice signals to calling party 70. In other words, the switching system 20 is part of the call routing path from the announcement system 30 to the calling party 70. If after the calling party listens to the voice signals and does not hang-up, the switching system 20 routes the call to called router 60. Lastly, the switching system 20 completes the call by establishing a connection between calling party 70 and called party 80 via the switching system 20 (Salimando, col. 4, lines 16-18; and Figure 1).

Within the Office Action, it is stated that the switching system 20 is analogous to the claimed control point. However, the control point of the present invention is independent of the call routing path. In contrast, the switching system 20 of Salimando is part of the call routing

path from the calling party 70 to the called party 80. As such, the claimed control point of the present invention and the switching system 20 of Salimando are not the same.

The amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an audible confirmation system in an Intelligent Network for allowing a calling party to audibly hear an audible name of a call recipient. The audible confirmation system comprises a database configured for storing a plurality of text names wherein each of the plurality of text names is associated with a unique identifier, a control point coupled to the database, the control point independent of a call routing path and configured to retrieve one of the plurality of text names in response to a call initiated by the calling party directed to the unique identifier, and a text to speech converter coupled to the control point and configured to convert the selected one of the plurality of text names into the audible name. As discussed above, Salimando does not teach a control point independent of a call routing path. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Salimando and as such is an allowable base claim.

Claims 2 and 3 are each dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Salimando. Accordingly, Claims 2 and 3 are each also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The amended independent Claim 4 teaches a method of allowing a calling party to audibly identify a call recipient. The method of Claim 4 includes initiating a call from the calling party directed to an identifier belonging to the call recipient, matching the identifier to a text name corresponding to the recipient within a database by a control point independent of a call routing path, retrieving the text name of the recipient from the database, converting the text name of the call recipient to an audible name, and audibly playing the audible name of the call recipient to the calling party prior to connecting the call. As discussed above, Salimando does not teach a control point independent of a call routing path. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of the independent Claim 4 is allowable over the teachings of Salimando and as such is an allowable base claim.

Claims 5 and 6 are each dependent upon the independent Claim 4. As discussed above, Claim 4 is allowable over the teachings of Salimando. Accordingly, Claims 5 and 6 are each also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Within the Office Action, Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salimando in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,655 issued to Fahrer et al. (hereinafter “Fahrer”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 7 is dependent on the independent Claim 4. As discussed above, Claim 4 is allowable over the teachings of Salimando. Accordingly, Claim 7 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salimando in view of Fahrer, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,737 issued to Finnigan. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 8 is dependent on the independent Claim 4. As discussed above, Claim 4 is allowable over the teachings of Salimando. Accordingly, Claim 8 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finnigan in view of Salimando. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The amended independent Claim 9 is directed to a method of allowing a calling party to audibly identify a call recipient. The method comprises pre-recording a voice message by the calling party directed toward an identifier belonging to the call recipient, matching the identifier to a text name corresponding to the call recipient by a control point independent of a call routing path, wherein the identifier and the text name are stored within a database, converting the text name of the call recipient to an audible name, and audibly playing the audible name of the recipient to the calling party. As discussed above, Salimando does not teach a control point independent of a call routing path. Within the Office Action, it is stated that Finnigan is cited for disclosing pre-recoding a voice message by the calling party directed toward an identifier and audibly playing the audible name of the recipient to the calling party. Finnigan does not teach matching the identifier to a text name by a control point, where the control point is independent of a call routing path. Therefore, neither Finnigan, Salimando, nor their combination teach a control point independent of a call routing path. For at least these reasons, the Applicants

respectfully submit that the subject matter of the independent Claim 9 is allowable over the teachings of Finnigan, Salimando, and their combination, and as such is an allowable base claim.

Claims 10-13 are dependent on the independent Claim 9. As discussed above, Claim 9 is allowable over the teachings of Finnigan, Salimando, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 10-13 are each also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finnigan in view of Salimando, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,090 issued to Tessler et al. (hereinafter "Tessler"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 14 is dependent on the independent Claim 9. As discussed above, Claim 9 is allowable over the teachings of Finnigan, Salimando, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 14 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 4-16-04

By: Thomas B. Haverstock  
Thomas B. Haverstock  
Reg. No. 32,571  
Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 4/16/04 By: [Signature]